UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/888,707	06/25/2001	Rob M. Trace	207385	8816

22971 7590 11/25/2005

MICROSOFT CORPORATION
ATTN: PATENT GROUP DOCKETING DEPARTMENT
ONE MICROSOFT WAY
REDMOND, WA 98052-6399

EXAMINER	
NGUYEN, QUANG N	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2141	

DATE MAILED: 11/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/888,707	TRACE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Quang N. Nguyen	2141	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *21 October 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,6-11,14-19 and 23-27* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,6-11,14-19 and 23-27* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *25 June 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Detailed Action

1. This Office Action is in response to the Amendment filed on 10/21/2005. Claims 1-2, 6, 10-11, 14, 18, 23-24 and 27 have been amended. Claims 3-5, 12-13 and 20-22 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 2, 6-11, 14-19 and 23-27 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 2, 6-11, 14-19 and 23-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coughlin et al. (US 6,810,411), hereinafter referred as Coughlin, in view of Pontoppidan et al. (US 2002/0161872), hereinafter referred as Pontoppidan.

4. As to claim 1, Coughlin teaches a method comprising:

first receiving, by a multiple interface naming proxy via a first network interface, the network resource name service request *(DNS server 120 receives a request to connect to the host 170 named as "www.site.com" from client 110)* (Coughlin, Fig. 1 and C3: L50-58);

first transmitting to at least one of the one or more subnets, via at least a second network interface, a name query request corresponding to the network resource name service request *(when the DNS server 120 does not have the IP address of the requested domain name, it communicates with one or more name servers such as authoritative server 140 or name servers 16, which could reside on the same or different subnets, i.e., reside on at least one of the one or more subnets, to resolve the IP address of the requested domain name)* (Coughlin, Fig. 1 and C4: L7-13); and

second receiving in response to the first transmitting step, by the machine via the second network interface, a name query response including a network address for the resource residing on at least one of the one or more subnets coupled to the machine via the second network interface *(in response to the request of the DNS server 120, the authoritative server 140 or one of the name servers 160 responds with a DNS packet having at least one IP address for the host 170 of the domain "www.site.com")* (Coughlin, Fig. 1 and C4: L53-57).

However, Coughlin does not explicitly teach the first network interface is a RAS interface and the second network interface is an interface linked to a local area network (LAN).

In a related art, Pontoppidan teaches **a remote access server (RAS) 20**, which could be installed on the same machine as gateway 22 as illustrated in Fig. 1,

connected to LAN switch 12 by network medium 16 *(i.e., connecting to LAN via a LAN interface)* **for accessing LAN 10 from a remote location** *(i.e., connecting to WAP terminal 50, i.e., a RAS client, via a RAS interface)*, wherein LAN 10 includes a network of computer equipments such as personal computer systems, a web server, a file server, an application server, etc. *(i.e., hence a name server could be implemented here as one of the server 14)* (Pontoppidan, Fig. 1, paragraphs [0011] and [0013-0015]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Coughlin and Pontoppidan to include the first network interface is a RAS interface and the second network interface is an interface linked a local area network (LAN) since such methods were conventionally employed in the art to enable a user to connect to a local/private network *(e.g., LAN, VPN, Intranets, etc.)* from a remote location via a RAS server *(and/or a gateway)* to access the resources residing on the network and/or to remotely configure, monitor and manage the network (Pontoppidan, paragraphs [0002-0003] and [0012]).

5. As to claim 2, Coughlin-Pontoppidan teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the DNS server 120 maintains a cache of name-to-address entries, the method further comprises the step of:

determining, in response to the first receiving step, that the cache does not contain any entry corresponding to a name identified in the name service request *(the DNS server 120 supplies the name-to-address conversion from a list of IP addresses available in a cache memory 130, if any)* (Coughlin, C3: L58-61 and C4: L7-13).

6. As to claim 6, Coughlin-Pontoppidan teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising the steps of accessing and establishing, by the RAS server 20 on behalf of the RAS client *(i.e., on behalf of WAP terminal 50)*, a connection between the RAS server and the resource residing on at least one of the one or more subnets coupled to the machine via the interface linked to the LAN *(i.e., establishing a connection to various servers 14 and/or management station 18 via the LAN switch 12)* (Pontoppidan, paragraph [0018]).

7. As to claim 7, Coughlin-Pontoppidan teaches the method of claim 1 further comprising the step of transmitting the network address via the RAS interface to a RAS client *(once the IP address is obtained, the DNS server 120 communicates the IP address to the client 110)* (Coughlin, C4: L53-57).

8. As to claim 8, Coughlin-Pontoppidan teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the network address is an Internet protocol (IP) address (Coughlin, C3: L3-8).

9. As to claim 9, Coughlin-Pontoppidan teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the RAS interface and interface linked to the LAN are linked to distinct local area networks (LANs) *(inherently, the remote WAP client 50 could connect to LAN 10 via RAS server 20 from another network such as another LAN, WAN or Internet)* (Pontoppidan, Fig. 1).

10. Claims 10-11 and 14-17 are corresponding computer-readable medium claims of method claims 1-2 and 6-9; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

11. Claims 18-19 and 23-26 are corresponding network server claims of method claims 1-2 and 6-9; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

12. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

13. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yanagidate et al. (US 6,128,664), hereinafter referred as Yanagidate.

14. As to claim 27, Yanagidate teaches a method, comprising:

receiving a resource name from a computer connected to a first one of the subnet links *(i.e., receiving a resource name "H1" from terminal 11a on the network (a) 11)* (Yanagidate, col. 6, lines 16-21);

resolving the resource name *(i.e., the address-translating device 14 looks up the host-name/private-address lookup table 14a to retrieve the private address "10.1.1.20", then the corresponding available IP address "202.10.10.1", correlated to the designated host name "H1")* (Yanagidate, col. 6, lines 21-25);

variably rendering a corresponding network address for a resource corresponding to the resource name residing on a second of the subnet links coupled to the router via a second subnet interface *(the retrieved IP address "202.10.10.1" is notified to the terminal 11a on the network 11 via one of network interfaces corresponding to respective IP addresses allocated to network 12 such as "202.10.10.1, 202.10.10.10, 202.10.10.11, 202.10.10.12, 202.10.10.13, and 202.10.10.14")* (Yanagidate, Fig. 2, col. 5, lines 29-36 and col. 6, line 64 – col. 7, line 6).

Response to Arguments

15. In the remarks, Applicant argued in substance that

(**A**) Claims 1, 10, and 18 are currently amended to recite that "name query requests are variably transmitted to at least one of plural subnets via an interface linked to a LAN".

As to point (**A**), in response to applicant's arguments, the recitation "name query requests are variably transmitted to at least one of plural subnets via an interface linked to a LAN" has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951).

(**B**) As described on page 11 (instead of page 10) of the specification of the present application, transmission of naming requests to subnets maybe variably disabled if such transmission is deemed to be, for example, undesirable, unneeded, or not useful. Thus, the independent claims have been amended to reflect such flexibility.

As to point (**B**), in response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies *(i.e., "transmission of naming requests to subnets maybe variably disabled if such transmission is deemed to be, for example, undesirable, unneeded, or not useful")* are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

16. Applicant's arguments as well as request for reconsideration filed on 10/21/2005 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive.

17. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Quang N. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-3886.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's SPE, Rupal Dharia, can be reached at (571) 272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).